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Abstract
To understand how much or how little progress is made in democratising higher education, an examination of transformation in the sector needs to be undertaken. Such an examination will reveal best practice, the sharing of which can move the process of transformation forward by inspiring those further beyond in the process. This article serves to fulfil that purpose. It comprises an assessment of equity and diversity in selected higher education institutions in the country that may be regarded as ‘best practice’. The study focussed on the university as an equity employer and thus staff equity is examined. The article reports the South African component of a five country study undertaken in late 2004.

INTRODUCTION
Equity and diversity initiatives are gaining currency in higher education institutions partially prompted by the constant reference to the lack of transformation in these institutions. Higher education institutions are generally thought of as being in the lead in the developments of equity and diversity initiatives. An 11-year development history makes South African higher education institutions interesting to examine. Equity and diversity at select institutions of higher education is the subject of this paper.

The terms equity, diversity, equality, equal opportunities among others are widely used but with little consensus as to their exact meanings. While these are socially constructed terms whose meanings are not always clearly defined or agreed to, they do form part of the discourse and policy relating to staff and students at institutions of higher education. It is therefore useful to clarify the terms as they are used in this paper. The concept of equality is derived from the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act 108 of 1996). In essence it refers to the equality of all persons before the law. This principle of equality supports all persons from any form of discrimination. Equity is the outcome of the Employment Equity Act (No 55 of 1998) to be achieved through the promotion of equal opportunity and fair treatment and elimination of unfair discrimination. The Act encourages the implementation of affirmative action measures to ensure the equitable representation of people from the designated groups in all
occupational levels and categories in the workforce. While equity is about equal opportunity and fair treatment, diversity is about accepting, acknowledging and accommodating differences in people in the workplace. These differences may be accommodated in a range of activities from changes in regulation to the more tangible accommodation of for example physical disabilities. Equity and diversity are thus featured in the policies and in their implementation in higher education institutions in South Africa, more particularly through the transformation agendas (focussing on the disadvantages of race and gender) in these institutions since 1994.

In view of the fact that this is an international study, the concept of equity is approached in an integrated way. In essence it refers to the use of processes, tools and mechanisms to promote equality of opportunity (both equality of access as well as equality of outcomes) in ensuring fair treatment of all. Diversity is about acknowledging and managing differences to attain multicultural institutions in which there is no form of discrimination. While a major focus of work into the subject internationally focuses on student equity, this study examined progress in staff equity at universities in South Africa.

**PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

Early in 2004, the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) supported by its counterparts in Scotland and Wales commissioned PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (PwC) to conduct an international comparative study to investigate how equality and diversity initiatives in other countries have led or failed to lead to significant change in higher education institutions. The study should establish lessons that might effectively be applied to higher education in the UK. PricewaterhouseCoopers worked with five partner countries for the study, namely, the United States, Belgium, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. The specific countries were selected by PwC for a variety of reasons. South Africa was included because of its unique position in regard to the transformation process occurring at every level of its society and because uniquely, its minority culture is the majority culture. This paper reflects on the South African study. An Overview Report of the Cross National Study may be accessed at the HEFCE website, www.hefce.org.uk.

**METHODOLOGY**

A qualitative design was formulated using case study methodology. Case study is a useful methodology when a holistic, in-depth investigation is needed (Feagin, Orum and Sjoberg 1991). Case study research delivers an understanding of a complex issue as it emphasizes a detailed contextual analysis of events and their relationships. Yin defines the case study research method as an empirical inquiry
that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used (Yin 1984, 23).

Multiple sources of evidence are used in a two-tranche methodology adopted for this study. The first stage and first source of evidence comprised depth interviews with key informants. This key informant was generally the individual in the ‘best practice’ higher education institution who played a central role in embedding equity and equality in the institution (the Equity Officer, Transformation Officer or Human Resources individual responsible for transformation at the institution). A pre interview questionnaire (called the Data Capture Document DCD) required completion by the key informant in advance of the interview. The second stage comprised focus group interviews with a range of employees of the institution representing the hierarchical levels of the institution as well as ethnicity, gender, religion and sexual orientation. The purpose of the focus group interviews was to capture the views of employees of the institution. It would prove interesting to compare the ‘official position’ of the institution with those of the people ‘on the ground’. Focus group participants used a different version of the Data Capture Document to record their perceptions of the institutions’ efforts in equity and diversity. Focus group participants were invited to score the institution’s performance on a scale of 1–5 against each of the criteria in the Innocence to Excellence Framework. The group were not informed of the outcomes of the scoring or the scorings of the key informants of the institution. This was in order that the group could give an impartial score, which could be used as a point of triangulation against the information and scoring provided in the DCD. This approach with multiple sources of evidence is designed to facilitate triangulation of the findings.

Benchmarking provides the opportunity and capacity for an institution to compare its performance with that of its peers. This is undertaken with a view to developing a process of self-improvement until the institution can be categorized as a ‘best practice’ institution in the area being studied. As benchmarking served the ultimate objective of the project, and as the issue had not been subjected to assessment in the past, the first phase involved the identification of ‘best practice’ institutions to be studied. The Council for Higher Education (an independent statutory body established in May 1998 in terms of the Higher Education Act and the Education White Paper 3 of 1997) was contacted to provide formal guidance on the selection of ‘best practice’ institutions. This process was not followed in view of the constraints of time. Peer group assessment of best practice was then considered appropriate. The first activity involved an examination of the Human Resources and/or Employment Equity websites of every higher education institution in the country. The outcomes of this process were: a list of persons responsible for equity or transformation and a sense of the levels of commitment to equity and diversity at the 37 institutions of higher education in South Africa. The policies that informed the equity activities of the institutions were also obtained.
through the web search. At the same time, a number of informal depth interviews were conducted with a variety of people, identifiable as: equity officers at higher education institutions, researchers in equity and diversity and experts from higher education who had an interest in equity issues. They were asked to provide a list of institutions that they thought were doing particularly well at achieving equity and diversity. The list comprised seven institutions that were defined as ‘worthy of investigation’ and formed the basis for the selection of four institutions that would be examined in depth for the study. Interestingly all seven may be described as previously advantaged institutions or ‘historically white institutions’. In discussions with key informants a plausible explanation for this selection may be that historically white universities would have much larger challenges in transformation. Interestingly too a number of historically white institutions have a history of activities in transformation. It was also reported in the initial contacts with ‘historically black institutions’ that they had not made much progress in ‘transformation’ as there was no real need to. It was also noted that some of these institutions did not have positions dedicated to Equity.

Eight universities formed the list of best practice institutions. Positive responses were received from three of these. Some universities on this list indicated an interest and willingness to participate but declined in view of time and resource constraints. It also became apparent during this process that the South African Universities Vice Chancellors Association (SAUVCA) was engaged in the data collection stage of a study on the impact of the Employment Equity Act (EEA) at South African higher education institutions in an attempt to identify best practice. This complicated the response from higher education institutions who saw the SAUVCA study as ‘burdensome’ in terms of time. Of the Universities of Technology who were approached to participate in the study two responded positively. Only one was included in the sample.

Background information on the project was sent off to the responsive institutions to assist them in making the decision. In most cases, the initial contact person had to obtain permission of the Vice Chancellor before proceeding further. Three institutions (of the seven) were excluded from the list at this stage. In one of the institutions, the Employment Equity Officer and the Vice Chancellor declined the invitation to participate in the study as they felt that it was inappropriate and that participating would divert them from their current activities. Two of the institutions commented on the importance of the study but could not dedicate the resources required at the particular point in time because of the particular constraints facing these institutions. Both these institutions were however forthcoming and allowed the researchers complete access to their policies, internal reports and other documents prepared for their institutions. It might have been possible to case study these two institutions with either a conference call or a limited time interview. These institutions were however not included in the study for the purposes of comprehensiveness.

Once permission was obtained, the person that could best represent the
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Invariably this was the Employment Equity Officer or that individual who was responsible for Employment Equity at the institution. Background information was forwarded to the individual, who became a key informant of the study. The individual was sent a copy of the Data Collection Document, which required completion in advance of the depth interview. The Data Collection Document comprised questions relating to Institutional Details, Staffing of the equity, equality and diversity function, Equity and diversity activities, Equity monitoring and the Innocence to Excellence Framework. The interview period was then used to probe the organisation’s journey to equality, equity and diversity through the Innocence to Excellence Framework.

THE INNOCENCE TO EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK

The Data Capture Document (DCD) was the standardised tool used to capture the information in each of the participating countries. It comprised a series of demographic questions (for Key Informants) as well as the ‘Innocence to Excellence Framework’ also referred to as the ‘maturity profile’. This Innocence to Excellence framework is a tool developed by PwC based on the European Foundation for Quality Management’s (EFQM) Excellence Model. The Excellence Model (of EFQM) is a tool used for improving quality and performance. Its use has spread beyond the corporate sector to a number of other sectors including government and education (www.british-learning.org.uk/efqm). Several pieces of research concluded that the EFQM excellence model is the most appropriate for business improvement of a university faculty (Hides, Davies and Jackson 2004, 197). The PwC model draws from EFQM in applying the Excellence model in the higher education sector. The Innocence to Excellence Framework as a component of a questionnaire-based self-assessment is useful in that it allows the institution to identify strengths, opportunities and improvement priorities. The standardized tool facilitated the collection of comparable data across the partner countries as consistent (and in this case as cross-national) points of reference.

The Innocence to Excellence framework defined 9 dimensions against which success may be measured in the field of equity and diversity. These fall broadly under three categories: Strategy and Institution, Implementation and Evaluation. The dimensions of the Innocence to Excellence Framework are discussed briefly below.

Top-level commitment

This is a critical success factor for the implementation of any policy in an institution. Innocence is demonstrated when there is no visible support or commitment within the institution. Excellence is achieved when the senior management pro-actively supports and promotes equality/diversity inside and
outside the institution and believes it makes a positive contribution to overall success. Excellence on this dimension may be measured by the Vice Chancellor’s position. He may espouse equity and diversity in the mission statement of the institution or indeed in his addresses to either internal or external audiences.

**Management systems and organisational culture**

This dimension comprises the systems and the culture in the institution. The management systems refer to the policies and procedures and supporting systems that are in place to sustain equity and diversity. Excellence on this score refers to institutions that have systems, policies and procedures linked to the wider institutional objectives, that are flexible and based on values rather than on rules. The dimension relating to organisational culture refers to the prevalence of a positive environment that is supportive of equity and diversity rather than one that relies on the rules. In respect of this particular dimension, it must be noted that while there are differences of opinion on cultures as they reside in institutions versus organisations, the position adopted in this paper is that an institution is a formal organisation. Hence the terms institutions and organisations are used are used interchangeably in this paper.

**Business aims and strategy**

This dimension focuses on the business case for equity and diversity. At the one end, institutions regard this as a necessary cost that does not contribute to the wider success of the institution. Excellence on this dimension refers to institutions that have embraced the concept as an integral component of corporate strategy. These institutions believe in the contribution of equity and diversity to the performance and success of the institution.

**Communication and awareness**

The quantity and type of communication relating to equity, equality and diversity in the institution makes up the content of this dimension. Innocence on this dimension may be seen in institutions that only communicate issues of equity and diversity that are required by law. On the other hand, excellence on this dimension may be seen in two-way communications relating to equity and diversity being a part of the culture of the organisation. These organisations conduct communications audits where they evaluate the effectiveness of the content, channels and media and modify them as necessary.

**Training**

Innocence on this score refers to those institutions that conduct little or no training. The training that is conducted by these institutions is viewed as an expense, while
excellent organisations see all forms of training as an important investment in the organisation. The training is seen as being integral to the organisation’s strategic change capability and a source of business advantage, and is regularly evaluated.

**Accountability and ownership**

This dimension refers to the manner in which accountability is required for equity and diversity. Excellence on this dimension is seen in institutions that have equity and diversity integrated into all management systems and is actively promoted throughout the organisation. Innocence on this score is evident in organisations that have no person in the organisation responsible for equity and diversity.

**Equality/diversity action planning**

Organisations that score excellence on action planning have formal planning processes that focus on the quality and contribution that employees make to the equity and diversity practices of the institution. At the other end, innocence in action planning is evident in formal statements but no action plans in place.

**Monitoring and adjustment**

No targets are set and no monitoring takes place in organisations that score innocence. Excellence is reserved for organisations that have a focussed and comprehensive monitoring process in place that is regarded as relevant by employees. Such a process provides quantitative and qualitative information that is fed into the planning process for the future.

**Problem solving**

Competent managers deal with complaints fairly and consistently in excellent organisations. In such organisations, employees feel confident in raising equity and diversity issues. Innocence on this dimension is seen in organisations that do not have any mechanisms in place to deal with issues of equity and diversity. These issues are dealt with on an ad hoc basis and based on the capability and inclinations of the managers.

These nine dimensions were presented in a framework with selection criteria ranging from Innocence to Excellence. Respondents were required to rate their institutions on each of the dimensions as follows: Innocence, Awareness, Understanding, Competence and Excellence. Each rating was explained on the Framework document to guide respondents in the selection of the rating for their institutions. The data from the DCD, the depth interviews and the focus group sessions were written up for each case study institution.
INDICATIVE FINDINGS

Four institutions of higher education made up the ‘best practice’ case study institutions. The institutions requested their anonymity and this was respected and applied to all participating institutions in the entire study. While a quantum of information was collected from the DCDs, the policy documents of the institutions (Equity Plans, special studies relating to equality, equity and diversity, institutional audits etc) the depth interviews and the focus groups, this section of the paper reports only on some significant issues and attempts to provide some international comparison.

INSTITUTIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE

An interesting issue not only for the South African cases but also for those in all of the countries studied is the infrastructural arrangements for equity and diversity. The location of the equity and diversity function in the organization is not prescribed but left to the institutions to determine. The institutions studied had no uniformity for the location of the function. Two institutions reported the function as part of the Human Resources Department; one institution located an Equity and Transformation Office reporting to the Vice Chancellor’s Office. The other institution reported Transformation residing in the Institutional Planning and Transformation, reporting directly to the Office of the Rector.

There appears from the evidence, no one preferred ‘site’ for the equity function nor is there any evidence from the limited numbers in the case studies of which works better. As one key informant put it: South African institutions are ‘feeling their way through the function’ as they work through the advantages and disadvantages of the different sites of location.

The New Zealand and United States case studies demonstrated best practice in those institutions where the equity and diversity function was located in the office of the Vice Chancellor.

While the formal arrangements for embedding equity and diversity are important, other countries reported success in those institutions were there were a number of informal initiatives/ structures in the institution. South African institutions had little to document in terms of the initiatives and informal structures (most commonly reported in internal and external networks) that were in place to facilitate equity and diversity. Informal or even semi formal initiatives lend credence to the formal arrangements and in many cases spur on the equity and diversity activities.

EQUITY AND DIVERSITY ACTIVITIES

Data was collected form key informants that related to the actual activities that occupied the time of the equity/transformation officers at the four case study institutions. Respondents were asked in the DCD about several types of activities
ranging from developing and implementing policy to involvement in external networks to communicating with the local community on equity and diversity issues. Respondents were also asked to rank the importance of the activities on a scale of 1 to 10 (1 = most important).

The data that were generated suggest that even in South African ‘best practice’ institutions, the activities that were engaged in and deemed high in priority were those that dealt with the specific functional aspects of legislative compliance. For example, the development of policy was rated 1 by all four institutions (most important), as was the preparation of the annual equity reports (which are required to be submitted to the Department of Labour in September of each year). Target setting, which is part of the legislative requirements, was also rated 1 by all four institutions. It would thus appear from the rankings, as well as from the depth interviews that equity officers are preoccupied with compliance as a major part of their daily activities.

It is also interesting to note that none of the institutions except one ranked the activity of ‘using equality/ diversity key performance indicators’ as most important. It appears from the interviews that Performance Management Systems are generally not implemented in higher education institutions (despite the articulation of their importance), let alone an inclusion of equality, equity and diversity becoming a KPA (Key Performance Area), which is also deemed important. Interestingly, this issue was advanced in all of the focus groups whose participants felt very strongly that there is no accountability for equality, equity and diversity in their institutions. While performance management and equity measurement appear to be gaining currency and relevance in higher education, as at 2003 South African institutions of higher education appeared reluctant to adopt (general) performance management systems (Franzsen 2003). They are indeed ‘slower than their international counterparts in establishing performance as a formal management practice’ (Franzsen 2003, 136). It is quite clear from the evidence collected that the South African legislation provides the key driver for activities in equity and diversity. Compliance is thus the major activity of equity personnel in the higher education institutions studied. The evidence for this was provided by both the activities noted by key informants and in their rankings and also in the type of data that was collected for monitoring purposes. Interestingly in some countries, the key driver for change came from the initiatives led by national agencies that provide an opportunity to stimulate change in HEIs through the complementary activities.

THE INNOCENCE TO EXCELLENCE FRAMEWORK

This section looks broadly at the scores (from innocence to excellence) generated from the key informants represented in Figure 1 and from the focus group represented in Figure 2. The more significant issues are raised in the discussion.
Almost without exception key informants interviewed for the study held more positive views of the equity initiatives than were the opinions articulated by the focus groups members of the organisation. It may be hypothesized from the informal remarks that more senior members of staff have better access to information (through their personal networks ‘at the top’) and therefore a more positive view of the equity and diversity activities in their institutions. Conversely, more frustration appears at lower levels of the institution.

**TOP LEVEL COMMITMENT**

This was defined as a factor critical to the success of the implementation of any
initiative in the institution and was regarded as such by both key informants as well as by focus group participants. Key informants of all four institutions rated their institutions a 3, which demonstrates the institutions’ understanding of the issue. Equity Officers noted the commitment of the leadership of their institutions to transformation to achieve equity and diversity in their institutions. They defined the major challenge as processes to filter these down to lower levels in the institution.

The issue was verified by the assessments from the focus group participants. The focus group score on this dimension was slightly lower than that presented by the key informants. In assessing the scores of group participants, it became apparent that individuals who had closer links with senior management presented the higher scores on this dimension. Members of the focus group who were not in management positions appeared to hold a more negative view of top-level commitment. This suggested a lack of awareness of the commitment at lower levels of the institutions.

It may be concluded from the responses presented by all, that while it is imperative that the leadership of an institution demonstrate dedicated commitment to equity and diversity (they are required to ‘walk the talk’) this is a necessary but not sufficient condition to achieve transformation. There must be processes in place to filter this commitment down to the lower levels of the institution. This has consequences for the communication and awareness dimension and how it is implemented in institutions.

**ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE**

The scores (of both key informants as well as focus group participants) on the overall dimension of management systems and organisational culture were confounded by the discussions on the culture at the institution. The particular context that South African Higher Education Institutions find themselves in, impacts on equity and diversity and is worth reporting here. The restructuring of the landscape through the mergers has resulted in a number of Historically White Institutions merging with Historically Black Institutions. The positive effect of such mergers is noted in the equity profiles of the new institution. However, even if the numerical targets are achieved, the challenge remains for the new institution to fully integrate all their staff (particularly black and white staff). While both types of respondents noted the management systems that were in place, almost all respondents commented negatively on the culture in their institutions in relation to transformation. The culture of the institutions with respect to equity and diversity was described negatively as ‘hostile, complacent, equity unfriendly etc’. These descriptions related to the prevailing atmosphere in the institutions.

Focus group members expressed differing levels of frustration, and different reasons were advanced for the negative culture at their institutions. These ranged from the ‘inability or unwillingness of the old guard to accept the changing
circumstances’ to ‘a complex system which is difficult to change’ to ‘extraneous factors’ to ‘making the noises that mean nothing’, to ‘the merger brings with it issues of culture’. What was clearly evident was the frustration expressed at the culture at almost all focus group discussions. While the legislative requirement prompted the development of policies, systems and procedures, the best-drafted policies are insufficient to transform the institutions.

It is noted that institutions of higher education are complex organisations which require careful attention to the prevailing culture to effect change. One mechanism to assess the prevailing culture in institutions is the climate survey. Climate surveys have been used by the best practice HEIs in South Africa as they had been in the United States and Belgium. Two of the case study institutions in the South African sample reported having undertaken climate studies. One conducted a survey on staff and students while the other examined the perceptions of staff only. Whilst the methodologies deployed were different, the documentation of the culture of the institution was critical to the development of strategies for the future management of equality and diversity. The two most frequent climate survey methods used in the States are focus group discussions and large-scale surveys. However the latter were often conducted on an ad hoc basis. For example new presidents at American HEIs have used it to help define their strategy going forward. Climate surveys in summary can serve the important purpose of informing the transformation strategy.

COMMUNICATION

This is an important activity in the quest for equity and diversity in an institution, which is advanced on awareness and knowledge. The size and complexity if many HEIs reportedly makes communication difficult. Despite this key informants reported a range of communication activities relating to equity and diversity. Some institutions were particularly advanced and implemented a variety of media for the communication efforts. Practically all informants commented on the importance of this function and those that were not doing a great deal attributed this to either a lack of funding or the constraints of using the institution’s current marketing division to achieve the effort. While the challenges were articulated there was evidence of one institution demonstrating innovative ways of communicating the effort to the wider university community despite the shortage of resources. The weekly university bulletins were used, as were the university’s intranet services. Brochures were widely distributed too. It may be suggested from the evidence of the interviews, that the activities in communication are really dependent on the importance attached to the function by the Employment Equity Officers.

The awareness of equity and diversity activities amongst focus group participants was generally low. This is the reason most focus group participants rated this dimension a 2. They bore the evidence of low levels of communication activity received by them at various levels of the institution. Indeed, even tangible pieces of communication (reported by key informants), were unknown to
participants of the focus groups of that institution. For example, when reference was made to the institutional climate/culture surveys of the institution (which the researchers accessed through the websites of the institution), group participants were largely unaware of the reports. Almost all focus group participants however, pointed to the importance of communication (both formal and informal).

A discrepancy in the supply and demand of communication activities was evident in the study. The discrepancy lay in what key informants reported and what focus group participants claimed. It may be speculated that either the information is not filtering through to the institution or that staff are unprepared to expose themselves to the information. The latter seems to hold true as it was remarked by one respondent, ‘we don’t have the time to read the lengthy documents to which there are links on the website’.

**CONCLUSION**

The case studies illustrate a variety of equity and diversity practices implemented in the five participating countries of the study. In addition the focus of the equity and diversity initiatives differed across the institutions in the different countries. The more developed countries focus their attention on achieving equity for women, minority groups and gay and lesbian communities, while South Africa strives to achieve equity for the majority of its people.

While the main driver for equity initiatives (and a justifiable one) is the external legislative one, even a demanding and sophisticated legislative environment is insufficient to transform institutions. A culture of compliance tends to dominate the activities of equity personnel operating in a strong legislative environment. One may conclude that a strong legislative requirement provides the basis and acts as an enabler to the achievement of equity and diversity in institutions. The impact of this legislation on the implementation of the equity and diversity agendas in institutions is less clear. This is an area worthy if future research.

A factor critical to the success of equity and diversity was articulated as top-level commitment to or leadership of equity and diversity in the institution. Leadership of the institution in best practice institutions across the study articulated a commitment to equity and diversity. However this too was perceived as a necessary but insufficient to achieve true transformation of an institution.

Accountability and ownership were viewed particularly important to all those that discussed the issue. There seemed to be consensus that there should be a performance management system in place that requires Heads (of Departments or Schools) to account specifically for the equity and diversity they undertake and the output of the effort. An interesting example of this was observed in one case study. Deans of Faculties were called to account to the Vice Chancellor when underperforming in the area of equity and diversity. Embedding equity and diversity requires the assessment of equity and diversity as a specific Key Performance
Indicator. The implementation of a rewards and penalties type system was promoted as being important in moving the equity agenda forward in institutions of higher education.

The PwC adaptation of the European Foundation for Quality Management’s Excellence model in the form of the Innocence to Excellence Framework or the Maturity Profile deserves note. The framework is valuable in that it allows for the evaluation of activities on dimensions critical to success in equity and diversity. The two-tranche methodology allowed for the assessment of the differences in the perception of the performance of the institution on the defined dimensions. These differences are not always apparent as was evident in the case studies where more positive ratings were declared by more senior staff and especially those with the responsibility for equity and diversity. The system thus allows for a ‘gap analysis’ which is useful in enabling institutions formulate interventions to reach their equity objectives.

South African institutions of higher education are not alone in the challenges they face in embedding equity and diversity in their institutions. While the focus of the activities and the particular circumstances may differ in different countries, the underlying principles and the challenges they face are not dissimilar. What is required is dedication and ingenuity in mainstreaming equity and diversity and ensuring that it remains on the agendas in institutions of higher education throughout the country.
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